



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

under the Black Prince. The policy of Charles V. was conspicuously able and the achievements of Du Guesclin remarkable. Yet part of the French success must be ascribed to the consummate folly of the Black Prince in the government of the south, and to the lack of efficient commanders among the English after the death of Sir John Chandos (1370), the noblest Englishman of them all; but the Prince's policy is dismissed in two lines and a half and Chandos's death not even mentioned.

After 1380 French history until Agincourt is less dependent upon English sources, and the latter portion of the book is less one-sided. It is strange, though, that when relying upon French sources merely, the French-Scotch alliance of 1383 to check the crusade of the bishop of Norwich in Flanders should fail of mention, the raid of the Scotch being later presented as an independent movement and one not inspired by France. This brevity to the point of sacrifice contrasts with the statement made relative to Philip Van Artevelde that "il avait rempli dans la ville quelques offices importants" (p. 278). The words seem superfluous, even untrue, unless there are Belgian authorities unknown to the eminent editor of Froissart.

When we come to the relations of France with the first Lancastrian King, the failure to use English sources still vexes the reader. A paragraph is devoted to an account of the vain-glorious challenge of the English King by the Duke of Orleans, as if it were of real historic importance. An examination of the first volume of the "Proceedings of the English Privy Council" would have cast a more valuable light upon the relations of the two countries and showed how French gold and guile fomented the Scotch war. A reference to Rymer would have trimmed the smoothness of this sentence: "Malgré tous ces défis, la trêve de vingt-huit ans fut expressément maintenue, confirmée tous les ans;" for as a matter of history, the English council was deliberating a declaration of war (Feb. 9, 1400) when the tardily approved truce (Jan. 29, 1400) was returned from Paris. Peace escaped into the temple of Janus by the narrow margin of eleven days!

The errors, fortunately, seem to be few; three of them (p. 37, 39, note, 58, note) are misprints in the case of English words. On p. 29, the affair of Cadzand happened November 9, 1337, and not in October; the bishop of Lincoln, instead of getting to Paris in 1337, as stated on p. 39, got no farther than Boulogne.

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON.

Henry V. The Typical Mediæval Hero. By CHARLES L. KINGSFORD. [Heroes of the Nations Series.] (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1901. Pp. xxxi, 418.)

THE successive volumes of the "Heroes of the Nations" series keep up to a very satisfactory grade of excellence. There are few if any of its volumes which fall below the standard of good serious historical work. Certainly this biography of Henry V. is no exception to the rule. It is based entirely on original authorities which are used with skill, care and

discretion. Moreover the combination of treatment of the more personal events of Henry's life, which are proper to a biography, with the more general description of the events of English history during that period, which is also necessary, is made with evident effort and with considerable success. The material left to us for showing the personality of any king or statesman of the fifteenth century, aside from the events of which he was a part, is scanty enough; and the life of Henry V., even more than the lives of others, was so completely bound up in his campaigns and diplomatic negotiations that the man apart from the king is scarcely more than a shadow. This brings up one of the few points of adverse criticism that can be made on the book. The author in his search for his hero's personality has been led to ascribe to Henry more general and far-reaching lines of policy than there is any warrant for believing he had. Henry seems to have been a specially laborious, practical, cold and direct man. To credit him with ultimate designs for a unification of Christendom, or with any definite "ideal of authority in church and state"; or to speak of him as "instinct with all the traditions of the past," or as "the champion of a lost cause," is to be misled by the requirements of the sub-title of the book.

With all respect to Dr. Stubbs, to whom this cognomen for Henry V. is due, and to Mr. Kingsford, who approves it, we cannot but feel that it is singularly ill-chosen. In the first place the expression "mediæval," as in some other places in the book, is somewhat of an anachronism when applied to a military commander who made use of cannon and of regularly paid volunteer soldiers in his campaigns, and to a ruler who obtained his income from taxes on exports, imports and personal property granted by a Parliament. It was just the things which were least medieval in fifteenth century England that Henry made use of most regularly. Moreover, the heroic impression made by Henry on his own and later times was almost entirely due to his military successes. He was not many-sided, like Edward I., for instance. His insistence on orthodoxy in religion was not unusual or striking. His sincere acceptance of existing constitutional limitations did not interest the contemporary man, however great the interest which it possesses for modern students. There was little that was medieval in Henry, and, except for the general mediocrity of his times, it would hardly have occurred to any one to elevate him to the position of a "hero," typical or otherwise.

Not that Henry V. was not a great man and an able ruler. Few men have had such uninterrupted success in what they have set their hands to do, and few have been so sorely missed when they dropped their work. This comes out clearly in Mr. Kingsford's narrative, which, notwithstanding his restricted space, discloses admirably the fine thoroughness of Henry's military and diplomatic preparations, and the steady accomplishment of his purposes.

We do not get much light on the old uncertainties of Henry's career, the extent of the excesses of his youth, his real reasons for renewing the French war, and his personal feelings toward Lollardy. But probably

there is no new light to be obtained on these from the existing material. Certainly the author has neglected none of this, and has not disregarded the problem. These besides were not the real matters of importance in Henry's career. Motives are less important historically than actions; and these Mr. Kingsford has given in a full, interesting and clear narrative. The book can be heartily praised, except that we should like to have seen the author refrain from giving to his subject a fanciful position as "the typical mediæval hero," and ascribe to him his true significance as a firm administrator of the old balanced English constitution of king and three estates, a brilliant leader of the nascent national feeling of England in the war against France, a conscientious king carrying out a clear if not very broad idea of his duty in that office.

E. P. CHEYNEY.

Charles le Téméraire et la Ligue de Constance. Par E. TOUTEY.
(Paris: Hachette. 1902. Pp. 475.)

THE scope of M. Toutey's book is broader than its title. What lies nearest his heart is neither the fortunes of Charles of Burgundy nor those of the League of Constance, but the beginnings, a score of years before the French invasion of Italy, of a European balance of power and of international congresses; and what he has really given us is scarcely less than a diplomatic history of central Europe in the time of Charles the Bold. Yet a diplomatic history only. Of military history, save as incident to diplomacy, one learns little more than of society or institutions, of letters or of art. Even Grandson and Morat are despatched with less than a page apiece, and with a vagueness in striking contrast to the graphic narrative of a Delbrück or a Kirk.

Though it is now nearing two score years since John Foster Kirk gave to the press his *Charles the Bold*, the American's is still the one biography of the great Burgundian; but in the interval a multitude of special studies have thrown light upon one or another episode of his career, and scholars have unearthed not a few documents which escaped the patient search of his biographer. Of this newer literature, as of the older, M. Toutey has made a wide and thorough use attested not less by his text than by the half-dozen pages of his appended bibliography. Reassuring to the English reader is the respect he still shows to the book of Mr. Kirk; yet point of view and results could hardly be more antipodal. Nor can this be charged wholly to the anti-Burgundian sympathies natural to a French scholar; for his facile use of German sources and the excellent temper with which he can discuss an Alsace and Lorraine still imperial, show, on the whole, a rare absence of chauvinism. Nay, when he once slips as to the allegiance of a province, it is to aver (p. 200, note) that "la plus grande partie de la Flandre relevait de l'empire."

Hear, then, his estimate of Charles (p. 70, note):

"It is well known that his contemporaries called him Charles le Hardi until 1472, then Charles le Terrible after his campaign of Nesle, Beauvais, Rouen, and finally Charles le Téméraire in the last years of his life, 'when